

**REMARKS**

This Amendment, submitted in response to the Office Action dated January 16, 2004, is believed to be responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-18 are all the claims pending in the application, including new claims 13-18 added by the present Amendment.

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimizu (US 5,987,230) in view of Yokomizo et al. (US 6,321,266). Applicant submits the following arguments in traversal of the prior art rejections.

Shimizu relates to an information processing apparatus such as a printer capable of designating the capacity of the memory to be used, a memory control method and a memory medium therefore. Shimizu also relates to an output device such as a printer for generating output data and outputting the data based on input data entered from an external equipment such as a host computer.

Yokomizo et al. relates to an information input/output control device and a method therefore. The method executes a required functional operation by converting data having a first data format needed to be processed into the data having a second data format, and by outputting the data having the second data format at a designated information terminal in a network environment, under which plural kinds of information terminals are available to be used.

Applicant submits that the applied references fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of the claims of the present invention, as set forth below.

***AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.111***  
***U. S. Application No. 09/688,134***

For claim 1, first, Applicant submits that Shimizu fails to disclose the device for allowing a user of the data terminal to choose whether to print the ad data on the same side of a recording sheet as the information or on the opposite side from the information. Here, the Examiner points to col. 1, lines 62-63. However, this portion of the reference merely discloses “the presence of two-sided printing control.” Such a general disclosure clearly fails to correspond to the specific features of claim 1. In other words, the presence of two-sided printing is far too general to be considered as disclosing the device for allowing a user of the data terminal to choose whether to print the ad data on the same side of a recording sheet as the information or on the opposite side from the information.

Second, Applicant submits that Shimizu does not teach or suggest the claimed print control device. Claim 1 recites a print control device that produces print image data for one side or for both sides from the information and the ad data in accordance with which side of the recording sheet the ad data is to print, and controls the printer in accordance with the print image data. The Examiner refers to col. 16, lines 64-67 of the reference for this feature of the claim, which discloses that “the user can utilize the information processing apparatus with default setting matching the loaded memory size, and can also control the memory size for printing by the setting from the operation panel or by the job.” Thus, the excerpt relates to controlling the memory size. However, the excerpt indicates nothing about producing print image data from the information and the ad data in accordance with which side of the recording sheet the ad data is to print.

Third, Applicant submits that the prior art fails to teach or suggest the claimed charge modification data sending device. The Examiner concedes that Shimizu does not disclose this

**AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.111**  
**U. S. Application No. 09/688,134**

feature of claim 1, but asserts that Yokomizo et al. discloses it. Specifically, the Examiner points to the Centronics I/F controller in col. 17, lines 19-20 of Yokomizo et al. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The Centronics I/F controller is simply a standard interface controller used in computer applications. By contrast, claim 1 recites a charge modification data sending device for sending data for modifying charge for provision of the information in accordance with amount of ad data printed with the information. An exemplary embodiment of the charge modification data sending device is discussed in the specification at page 12, line 8 – page 13, line 13, for example. Clearly, the Centronics I/F controller does not correspond to the claimed charge modification data sending device.

Therefore, for at least the above-noted reasons, claim 1 and its dependent claims 2 and 3 are allowable over the prior art.

For claim 4, Applicant submits that Shimizu does not teach or suggest the claimed sorting device. Claim 4 recites a sorting device for detecting a category of the information to print, and automatically sorting out those ad data relating to the category of the information. The Examiner asserts that FIG. 19 and col. 13, lines 46-47 disclose this feature of the claim, but Applicant disagrees. The cited portions of the reference disclose mask information extending over plural bands of data. By contrast, the reference does not disclose detecting a category of the information to print or automatically sorting out those ad data relating to the category of the information.

***AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.111***  
***U. S. Application No. 09/688,134***

Also, the prior art fails to teach or suggest the claimed memory device, print control device, and charge modification data sending device of claim 4 for reasons analogous to those presented above for claim 1.

Thus, claim 4 and its dependent claim 6 are allowable over the prior art for the above-described reasons.

Applicant submits that claim 7 is allowable over the prior art for reasons analogous to those presented above in relation to claim 4.

Further, claims 8 and 9 are allowable, at least because of their dependence from claim 7.

Additionally, claim 10 and its dependent claims 11 and 12 are allowable over the prior art for reasons analogous to those presented above for claim 1.


Applicant adds new claims 13-18 to further define the present invention. These claims are allowable over the prior art, at least because of their dependence from claims 1, 4, 7 and 10.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

**AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.111**  
**U. S. Application No. 09/688,134**

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Cameron W. Beddard  
Registration No. 46,545

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 12, 2004